

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Ph

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION		
10/675,958	10/02/2003	Kunihiro Shiota	8013-1040-1 5898		
466	7590 07/07/2005		EXAMINER		
YOUNG & THOMPSON			PARKER, KENNETH		
745 SOUTH 1 2ND FLOOR	23RD STREET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ARLINGTON, VA 22202			2871		
			DATE MAILED: 07/07/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/675,95	8	SHIOTA, KUNIHIRO				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Kenneth A	. Parker	2871				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SH THE - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC nsions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commu period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) period for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply wreply received by the Office later than three months afted patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. f 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no evenication. days, a reply within the statutory period will apply and will ly by statute, cause the apply	nt, however, may a reply be tim story minimum of thirty (30) day: Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ication to become ABANDONE	ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)[🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>25 <i>April</i> 2005</u> .						
· ·	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	 ✓ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application. ✓ 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. ✓ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ✓ Claim(s) 1-4 and 12 is/are rejected. ✓ Claim(s) 5-11 and 13-19 is/are objected to. ✓ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 							
Applicat	ion Papers							
10)□	The specification is objected to by the The drawing(s) filed on is/are: Applicant may not request that any object Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the oath or declaration is objected to	a) accepted or b) ion to the drawing(s) be he correction is require	e held in abeyance. See ed if the drawing(s) is ob	e37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)	.			
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
2) Notice 3) Infor	e of References Citéd (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F er No(s)/Mail Date 3 はがり、シルクリント		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D: 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim et al 6100954.

The reference shows regarding claim 1. A layered structure comprising: a transparent organic layer 159 having a planarized transparent organic surface and a hole; and a first transparent layer overlying said planarized transparent organic surface only except within said hole 181.

The reference shows regarding 2. The structure as claimed in claim 1, further comprising a second transparent layer, which has an electrical conductivity and extends over said transparent protection layer and on a bottom and side walls of said hole 131.

Application/Control Number: 10/675,958

Art Unit: 2871

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-4 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al 6100954 in view of Kozaki et al 4240710.

The reference shows regarding claim 12 a transparent liquid crystal display comprising: a first substrate 111;

an inorganic inter-layer insulator layer extending adjacent to said first substrate 179; a transparent organic layer 159 having a planarized transparent organic surface and a hole, said transparent organic layer extending adjacent to said first substrate; a transparent protection layer 181covering said planarized transparent organic surface except within said hole;

a transparent pixel electrode layer 131 extending adjacent to said transparent protection layer and on a bottom and side walls of said hole; and a second substrate and liquid crystal between the first and second substrate (not shown, but discussed in in the column 1, lines 66- column 2, line 16).

Application/Control Number: 10/675,958

Art Unit: 2871

However, regarding this claim, the primary reference lacks the first orientation film; and second orientation film adjacent to said liquid crystal and an opposite electrode film adjacent to said second orientation film.

The opposite electrode is inherent, as the device could not operate without it. So this limitation is met by the inherent nature of an opposite electrode in any LCD having the pixel structure of Kim.

The orientation layers were always used, and Kozaki evidences this discussing in column 1 "It is well known that in implementing the rubbing or evaporation technique is carried out so as to attain molecular alignment", and goes on "On a glass support 1 there is depositied a transparent conductive film....A SiO film or an alignment film 3 is further deposited".

Therefore one of ordinary skill would have found motivation, suggestion or reason to modify the disclosure of Kim and place an alignment layer down on the electrodes as was conventionally done to enable creation of an alignment condition. The reference goeson to indicate that tehy have a method depositing multiple SiO layers including SiO2 that fives stable and goood alignment (column 3, lines 30-55). Therefore one of ordinary skill would further have found reason, motivation or suggestion to modify the primary reference to put down the multilayer SiO alignment layer including SiO2 of Kozaki for the benfit stated above. As the primary reference Kim, employes an SiO2

layer as the protection layer, and the secondary reference adds an alignment layer over the pixel electrode and also in the hole, the combination then meets the limitation of claim 3 of having the second and third layers as the same material.

Therefore the reference as modified meets the limitations of claim 3 wherein said first and second transparent layers are made of the same material, and claim 4 where the material is indium tin oxide or silicon dioxide.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of group 1 in the reply filed on 4/25/05 is acknowledged.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-11 and 13-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

None of the prior art taught or suggested A layered structure comprising: a transparent organic layer with a planarized transparent organic surface and a hole;

Art Unit: 2871

and a first transparent layer overlying said planarized transparent organic surface only except within said hole, a second transparent layer, which has an electrical conductivity and extends over said transparent protection layer and on a bottom and side walls of said hole where (claim 13) the transparent protection layer and said transparent pixel electrode layer are made of the same material, or (5) where the first and second transparent layer are made of the same material and in first transparent layer comprises a transparent protection layer, and said second transparent layer comprises a transparent pixel electrode layer.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Yamaji 5721601

Kitagawa 6117792

Miyagaki et al 5094978

Sakamoto 5714790

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth A. Parker whose telephone number is 571-272-2298. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:30-6:00.

Page 7

Application/Control Number: 10/675,958

Art Unit: 2871

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on 571-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Minneth A Parker Primary Examiner Art Unit 2871